## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

ASHAD R.A. MUHAMMAD ALI,	)	
Petitioner,	)	
V.	)	No. 3:03-0644 Judge Nixon
TENNESSEE BOARD OF PARDON AND PAROLES,	)	Judge Hixon
Respondent.	)	

## ORDER

The court has before it a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* filed by a *pro se* prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which the Court previously construed as having been brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. As provided in the Memorandum entered contemporaneously herewith, the petitioner's request for federal *habeas corpus* relief (Docket Entry No. 1) is DENIED and this action is DISMISSED. Rule 8, Rule – Section 2254 Proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

When the district court denies a ground for relief on the merits in a habeas corpus action, a certificate of appealability (COA) "may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right," 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the standard being whether "reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). The Court has independently determined that the petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right in any of his claims, and that reasonable jurists would not find the Court's assessment of the petitioner's claims debatable or wrong. Therefore, should the petitioner file a timely notice of appeal from this Order, such notice shall be docketed as both a notice of appeal and an application for a COA, 28

The rules pertaining to § 2254 petitions are applicable to the instant petition brought pursuant to § 2241. Rule 1 – § 2254 Cases.

U.S.C. § 2253(c); Slack, 529 U.S. at 483; Rule 22(b), Fed. R. App. P., which will NOT issue. See Castro v. United States of America, 310 F.3d 900, 901 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002); Murphy v. Ohio, 263 F.3d 466, 467 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001); Porterfield v. Bell, 258 F.3d 484, 485-487 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001); Lyons v. Ohio Adult Parole Auth., 105 F.3d 1063, 1073 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997).

Entry of this Order shall constitute the judgment in this action. It is so ORDERED.

John T. Nixon

Senior United States District Judge